

REMARKS

By the *Office Action* of 20 January 2004, Paper No. 18, Claims 8, 10-11 and 16-19 are pending in the Application, and all rejected. By the present *Response and Amendment After Final Rejection*, Applicant clarifies the parentable distinctions between the cited prior art and the present invention as cited by the Claims, amends Claims 8 and 17-19, and cancels Claims 10-11.

No new matter is believed introduced by the present *Response and Amendment After Final Rejection*. It is respectfully submitted that the present Application is in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

1. Claim 8

Claim 8 has been amended for clarity in an attempt to overcome the indefiniteness of the Claim. Claim 8 further includes features directed to the front-part and rear-part components of Claims 10 and 11, now cancelled.

The front-part component and the rear-part component are recited in Claim 8 as incorporating "*convex*" connection parts on the peripheral edge, which aspect of Claim 8, among others, is believed novel and non-obvious over the cited art.

Claim 8 is further amended to recite that the present club has only one hollow structure between the front face and the back wall of the club.

All of the clarifications to Claim 8 are clear from the figures and *Specification* as originally filed. Further, the amendments *do not* raise new matter issues or raise issues requiring further consideration or searches.

2. Rejection Of The Claims

Claims 8, 10-11 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 8 now excludes the rejected language, Claims 10-11 are canceled, and Claims 14-19 present the definite structure of Claim 8.

Claims 8, 10-11 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,255,918 to Anderson et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

First, Anderson et al. is a club head with more than a single hollow structure, not unlike US Patent No. 6,165,081 to Chou that was fully distinguished by the Applicant in a 12 December 2002 *Response and Amendment*. Chou is a two face, and thus two hollow, structure club head.

The present invention is an improvement over the Chou-type and Anderson et al.-type conventional club head. The Anderson et al. device is essentially a two-face-plate club, having two hollow structures, which such prior art is specifically addressed as distinguishable in the present Application. See 12 December 2002 *Response and Amendment*.

Nonetheless, to further distinguish the present invention from Anderson et al., Claim 8 is amended to recite that only a single hollow structure is defined in the club head. Both recesses 41 and 42 of the Anderson et al. club illustrate that it has more than one hollow structure, and the Examiner's own description of Anderson et al.'s teachings show that the Anderson et al. club head includes more than a single hollow structure.

Further, Claim 8 has been clarified to expressly recite that the front-part component and the rear-part component each incorporate a "convex" connection part. In the club head of Anderson et al., the face plate 21 is attached to the ledges 28, 31, and the face plate 21 does not have any convex parts on the peripheral edge thereof seen from the structure as shown in Fig. 2 of Anderson et al.

It is respectfully submitted that the Claims upon entrance of this *Response and Amendment After Final Rejection* are non-obvious in view of Anderson et al. as that reference does not teach or suggest a convex part as recited by the present Claims, nor a single hollow structure.

It is further submitted that the amendments to Claim 8 do not place this Claim back under the teachings of Japanese Publication No. 08-168541, as that reference was fully distinguished by the Applicant in a 16 December 2003 *Response and Amendment*. In the club head of Japanese Publication No. 08-168541 as well, the face part 2 does not have any convex parts on the peripheral edge thereof as shown in Figs. 1 and 5.

Claims 10 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. in view of US Patent No. 5,683,310 to Chen. This ground of rejection is similarly traversed, as put forth above, as the combination of Anderson et al. with Chen cannot

make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, as Anderson et al. is wholly missing elements of Claim 8 of the presently-claimed invention, and Chen does not cure those deficiencies.

Chen discloses the face 21 having the shoulder 211 on the peripheral edge thereof as shown in Fig. 4. However, the shoulder 211 is not connected to the convex part on the peripheral edge of the circular frame 22.

As distinguished from Anderson et al., Japanese Publication No. 08-168541, and Chen, the present invention incorporates convex connection part 6 on the peripheral edge of the front-part component 10, and the convex connection part 6 on the peripheral edge of the rear-part component 11, which are joined with each other.

With such convex part structure, in addition to the fully enclosed hollow structure and the cavity back structure, it is possible to markedly increase the effective deflection length *L* in the golf club head. None of the cited art teaches or suggests that the effective deflection length *L* can be increased remarkably by providing the convex connection part with the peripheral edge of the front-part and the rear-part components.

3. Fees

Presently, the Application has twenty or less total Claims, and three or less independent Claims. Thus, it is believed no additional Claim fees are due.

Further, this *Response and Amendment After Final Rejection* is being filed within six months of the *Final Office Action*, and more specifically within three months. Thus, it is believed no Extension of Time fees are due.

Nonetheless, authorization to charge deposit account No. 20-1507 is given herein should any fees be due.

CONCLUSION

By the present *Response and Amendment After Final Rejection*, the Application has been placed in full condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests early and favorable action. Should the Examiner have any further questions or reservations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned Attorney at 404.885.2773.

Certificate of Transmission:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office in accordance with §1.6(d) on this date, and the correspondence includes a certificate for each piece of correspondence stating the date of transmission. The person signing the certificate has a reasonable basis to expect that the correspondence would be transmitted on or before the date indicated.

Pamela J. Arthur

NAME of Applicant, Assignee, or
Registered Proprietor, etc.

Pamela J. Arthur

Signature

12 April 2004

Date

Respectfully submitted,



Ryan Schneider
Registration No. 45,083

Troutman Sanders LLP
Bank of America Plaza
600 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 5200
Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216
United States
Phone: 404.885.2773
Fax: 404.962.6849